



Our Docket No. 20010202.ORI

#2
11/8/03

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Re App : Anderson
S.N. : 09/880,532 Art Unit 3673
Filed : 06/13/2001 Examiner Kreck
For : Walk Behind Floor Stripping Machine with Hydraulic Drive

RESPONSE

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

Dear Sir:

This paper is a CPA in response to the office action mailed 09/30/02.

REMARKS

The applicant has submitted the attached affidavit under 37 CFR § 1.132 in rebuttal of the examiner's prima facie finding of obviousness of the invention being claimed.

The applicant believes the invention is not obvious because the Fisher reference is from a diverse art. The power requirements for propelling a rotary broom and for propelling a blade through flooring are totally unrelated. Further the importance of adjusting the speed of the floor stripping machine to match the ability of the floor stripper to strip flooring is absent in the Fisher reference. Therefore one skilled in the art of floor stripping machines would not look to the diverse art of sweeping machines for combining the hydraulic wheel drive of Fisher with either Anderson 809 or Anderson 566.

The applicant therefore believes that Claims 1, 7 and 19 are allowable over Fisher in view of Anderson and that the dependent claims based on claims 1, 7 and 19 are also allowable.

The applicant submits that it was not obvious to combine Fisher with Anderson due to the many diverse factors, which have to be considered to derive the result of the combination.